UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,099	04/23/2004	Lambert Wixson	024478-00023	7522

4372	7590	10/19/2009

ARENT FOX LLP
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/19/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com
IPMatters@arentfox.com
Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 July 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-9, 19, 24-29 and 36-56</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>10-18, 20-23, 30-35, and 57</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/09 has been entered.

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-18, 20-23, and 57 as filed on 7/29/09

have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3.   Claims 30-35 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini

et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Amini") in view in view of Maeno.

4.   The Applicant presents two arguments contending the Examiner's pending rejection of

claims 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini et al., (hereinafter

referred to as "Amini") in view in view of Maeno. However, after a careful consideration of the

arguments presented, the Examiner must respectfully disagree, and maintain the grounds of

rejection for the reasons that follow.

        After establishing the salient features of the claims 10-18, and 20-23 (RCE of 7/29/09:

page 12, lines 14-22), providing Applicant's analysis of the previously rejection used against

claims 10-18, 20-23 (RCE of 7/29/09: page 13, lines 1-7), the Applicant argues that the "creating

an audit spreadsheet" limitation is not met (RCE of 7/29/09: page 13, lines 8-14), and further

argues that this limitation is present in claims 30-35 (RCE of 7/29/09: page 14, lines 15-23). The

Examiner respectfully disagrees. .In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to

show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

relies (i.e., "an audit spreadsheet") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims

are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See *In re Van Geuns,* 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner

notes that the "spreadsheet" format of the generated report is not specified in independent claim

30, nor in any of the dependent claims. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that Amini's cell

based calendar representation with each cell containing surveillance system data reads upon the

claims.

Lastly, the Applicant's argue that Amini fails to address the "...calculating a compliance

percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one more such stored audit

items..." (RCE of 7/29/09: page 13, lines 16-19) because while it does disclose binary state

generate with regards to affirmative/negative state conditions concerning the surveillance system

(RCE of 7/29/09: page 13, lines 20-23; page 14, lines 1-5), the Applicant's argue that such a

tabulation of states doesn't disclose or suggest "..."...calculating a compliance percentage in one

or more reports based on the classification of one more such stored audit items..." (RCE of

7/29/09: page 14, lines 5-10), as in the claims. The Examiner flatly disagrees. The Examiner

notes that since system performance is based on the event processing parameters (Amini: column

9, lines 65-67; column 10, lines 1-3) in the configuration file (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47 and

61-64), these actions are based on compliance binary states, which the Examiner has already

asserted reads on the percentage limitation. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that the

limitation remains met.

A detailed rejection of claims 10-18, 20-23, 57 follows, and for the Applicant's

convenience, the previously pending detailed rejection of claims 30-35 has been repeated, as

well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

6.   Claims 10-18, 20-23, 30-35 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not falling

within one of four statutory categories of inventions. Supreme Court precedent[1] and recent

Federal Circuit decisions indicate a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. § 101 must (1) be tied to

another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject

matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing[2]. While the instant claim(s)

recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim(s) neither transform underlying subject

matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method

steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. For example there is not apparatus

mentioned either in the preamble nor in the subsequent limitations for executing the method (i.e.

elements are not sufficiently specified for performing the "…creating an audit spreadsheet…" or

"…selecting an audit item…", and the subsequent steps of **independent claims 10, 15, 30, and**

57, nor is the generation of audit spreadsheet reports considered the transformation of data, and it

---

[1] *Diamond v. Diehr,* 450 U.S. 175, 184, (1981); *Parker v. Flook,* 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978);
Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70, (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener,* 94 U.S 780, 787-788 (1876).
[2] The Supreme Court recognized that this test is not necessarily fixed or permanent and may
evolve with technological advances. *Gottschalk v. Benson,* 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972).

is readily possible to implement the methods claimed by a series of mental steps as executed by a

person, *In re Bilski,* *88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 10-18, 20-23, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Amini et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Amini") in view of Junkins et al., and further in

view of Maeno.

Amini discloses a method for performing remote video audits (Amini: figures 7-8), the

method comprising: creating an audit representation containing a plurality of audit items (Amini:

column 14, lines 5-17); selecting at least one of the plurality of audit items (Amini: column 14,

lines 15-20); obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item (Amini: column 14,

lines 30-40); entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video

information (Amini: column 9, lines 55-65: event processing/determination of the video), storing

the selected audit item after the classification is entered (Amini: column 14, lines 65-67; column

15, lines 1-6: storing of the event specific video footage); and calculating a compliance

percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit

items (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance

percentage of stored event video), as in claim 10. However, Amini fails to specifically disclose

creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items and having the video

information include video stills as in the claims. Junkins discloses workspace video monitoring

and archiving system and method (Junkins: column 2, lines 49-67; column 3, lines 1-10) which

discloses the use of a spreadsheet application (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40) to generate reports

that specify the state of the monitoring system at the capture time of the video stream (Junkins:

column 5, lines 45-65) in order to help a user navigate and readily manipulate a plurality of

entries in video library (Junkins: column 3, lines 30-67). Accordingly, given this teaching of

using spreadsheets as shown by Junkins, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in

the art to incorporate said teaching into the Amini method in order to modify it's GUI's cell based

visual representation of a calendar (Amini: column 14, lines 5-17) with the Junkins' spreadsheet

application to gain the advantage of a calendar spreadsheet that allows for monitoring state

entries at the capture time of the video stream such that a user that more easily and readily

navigate and manipulate entries in a video library. The Amini method, now incorporating the

Junkins spreadsheet application, has a majority of the features of claim 10, but still fails to

disclose the use of generating video stills, as in the claims. Maeno discloses a crime prevention

monitoring system and method (Amini: column 5, lines 10-45) which takes live video and

generates still video images of an intruder in the committing of a crime (Maeno: column 7, lines

35-67; column 8, lines 1-68; column 9, lines 1-7: still image extraction as executed by the image

collator of figure 2, element 206) in order to generate associated video indicia for monthly

surveillance report generation (Maeno: column 9, lines 13-47). Accordingly, given this teaching,

it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator into the Amini

method in order to gain the advantage of augmenting the event database with generated reports

so that a more comprehensive archiving of the Amini surveillance footage can be obtained. The

Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image

extraction as implemented by the image collator, has all of the features of claim 10.

Regarding claim 11, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet

application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has

wherein the classification is accompanied by a predefined note (Maeno: column 9, lines 20-45),

as in the claim.

Regarding claim 12, Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet

application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has

wherein the obtained video information is video stills (Maeno: column 7, lines 45-67) obtained

via a spreadsheet (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40) hyperlink (Amini: column 14, lines 5-18), as

in the claim.

Regarding claim 13, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet

application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has

wherein the obtained video information is video clips (Amini: column 12, lines 30-43) obtained

via a spreadsheet (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40) hyperlink (Amini: column 14, lines 5-18), as

in the claim.

Regarding claim 14, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet

application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has

wherein the plurality of audit items is selected from a group (Amini: column 8, lines 60-67)

consisting of location (Amini: column 14, lines 50-65), time interval (Amini: column 14, lines

15-25), camera (Amini: column 15, lines 55-60), and device mapping to camera (Amini: column

17, lines 35-45), as in the claim.

Amini discloses a method for performing remote video audits (Amini: figures 7-8), the

method comprising: selecting an audit item from an audit representation (Amini: column 14,

lines 15-20); obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item (Amini: column 14,

lines 30-40); entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video

information (Amini: column 9, lines 55-65: event processing/determination of the video), storing

the selected audit item after the classification is entered (Amini: column 14, lines 65-67; column

15, lines 1-6: storing of the event specific video footage); and calculating a compliance

percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit

items (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance

percentage of stored event video), as in claim 15. However, Amini fails to specifically disclose

creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items and having the video

information include video stills as in the claims. Junkins discloses workspace video monitoring

and archiving system and method (Junkins: column 2, lines 49-67; column 3, lines 1-10) which

discloses the use of a spreadsheet application (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40) to generate reports

that specify the state of the monitoring system at the capture time of the video stream (Junkins:

column 5, lines 45-65) in order to help a user navigate and readily manipulate a plurality of

entries in video library (Junkins: column 3, lines 30-67). Accordingly, given this teaching of

using spreadsheets as shown by Junkins, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in

the art to incorporate said teaching into the Amini method in order to modify it's GUI's cell based

visual representation of a calendar (Amini: column 14, lines 5-17) with the Junkins' spreadsheet

application to gain the advantage of a calendar spreadsheet that allows for monitoring state

entries at the capture time of the video stream such that a user that more easily and readily

navigate and manipulate entries in a video library. The Amini method, now incorporating the

Junkins spreadsheet application, has a majority of the features of claim 15, but still fails to

disclose the use of generating video stills, as in the claims. Maeno discloses a crime prevention

monitoring system and method (Amini: column 5, lines 10-45) which takes live video and

generates still video images of an intruder in the committing of a crime (Maeno: column 7, lines

35-67; column 8, lines 1-68; column 9, lines 1-7: still image extraction as executed by the image

collator of figure 2, element 206) in order to generate associated video indicia for monthly

surveillance report generation (Maeno: column 9, lines 13-47). Accordingly, given this teaching,

it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator into the Amini

method in order to gain the advantage of augmenting the event database with generated reports

so that a more comprehensive archiving of the Amini surveillance footage can be obtained. The

Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image

extraction as implemented by the image collator, has all of the features of claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet

application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has

wherein the classification is accompanied by a predefined note (Maeno: column 9, lines 20-45),

as in the claim.

Regarding claim 17, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has wherein the video information comprises video stills (Maeno: column 7, lines 45-67), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 18, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has wherein the video information comprises video clips (Amini: column 10, lines 20-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 20, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has a further comprising selecting a next audit item from the audit (Amini: column 13, lines 55-67) spreadsheet (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 21-22, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has further comprising: generating a report, including information describing the at least one audit item and the classification (Maeno: column 9, lines 20-47); and transmitting the report to at least one designated recipient (Amini: column 10, lines 25-40), as the claims.

Regarding claim 23, the Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has wherein the classification is selected form a group consisting of Pass or Fail (Maeno: column 10, lines 40-58), Not Audited (Amini: column 5, lines 30-35: "Live"), Don't know (Amini: column 17, lines 45-55), and No Video (Amini: column 18, lines 25-35), as in the claim.

Amini discloses a method for performing remote video audits (Amini: figures 7-8), the

method comprising: creating an audit representation containing a plurality of audit items (Amini:

column 14, lines 5-17); selecting at least one of the plurality of audit items (Amini: column 14,

lines 15-20); obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item (Amini: column 14,

lines 30-40); entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video

information (Amini: column 9, lines 55-65: event processing/determination of the video), storing

the selected audit item after the classification is entered (Amini: column 14, lines 65-67; column

15, lines 1-6: storing of the event specific video footage); and calculating a compliance

percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit

items (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance

percentage of stored event video), as in claim 57. However, Amini fails to specifically disclose

creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items, wherein the audit spreadsheet

includes an audit execution checklist, and having the video information include video stills as in

the claims. Junkins discloses workspace video monitoring and archiving system and method

(Junkins: column 2, lines 49-67; column 3, lines 1-10) which discloses the use of a spreadsheet

application (Junkins: column 5, lines 30-40) to generate reports that specify the state of the

monitoring system at the capture time of the video stream (Junkins: column 5, lines 45-65) in

order to help a user navigate and readily manipulate a plurality of entries in video library

(Junkins: column 3, lines 30-67). Accordingly, given this teaching of using spreadsheets as

shown by Junkins, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate

said teaching into the Amini method in order to modify it's GUI's cell based visual representation

of a calendar (Amini: column 14, lines 5-17) with the Junkins' spreadsheet application to gain the

advantage of a calendar spreadsheet that allows for monitoring state entries (i.e. "the audit

execution checklist") at the capture time of the video stream such that a user that more easily and

readily navigate and manipulate entries in a video library. The Amini method, now incorporating

the Junkins spreadsheet application, has a majority of the features of claim 10, but still fails to

disclose the use of generating video stills, as in the claims. Maeno discloses a crime prevention

monitoring system and method (Amini: column 5, lines 10-45) which takes live video and

generates still video images of an intruder in the committing of a crime (Maeno: column 7, lines

35-67; column 8, lines 1-68; column 9, lines 1-7: still image extraction as executed by the image

collator of figure 2, element 206) in order to generate associated video indicia for monthly

surveillance report generation (Maeno: column 9, lines 13-47). Accordingly, given this teaching,

it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator into the Amini

method in order to gain the advantage of augmenting the event database with generated reports

so that a more comprehensive archiving of the Amini surveillance footage can be obtained. The

Amini method, now incorporating the Junkins spreadsheet application and the Maeno still image

extraction as implemented by the image collator, has all of the features of claim 57.

9.   Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini et

al., (hereinafter referred to as "Amini") in view in view of Maeno.

        Amini discloses method for performing remote video guard tours (Amini: figures 7-8),

the method comprising: selecting a guard tour from a list of available guard tours (Amini:

column 14, lines 15-20); obtaining image information for a next stop on the selected guard tour;

reviewing the image information (Amini: column 14, lines 30-40); and entering a classification

for the guard tour stop based on the review (Amini: column 9, lines 55-65), as in claim 30.

entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information

(Amini: column 9, lines 55-65: event processing/determination of the video), storing the selected

audit item after the classification is entered (Amini: column 14, lines 65-67; column 15, lines 1-

6: storing of the event specific video footage); and calculating a compliance percentage in one or

more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items (Amini: column

9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance percentage of stored event

video), as in claim 30. However, Amini fails to specifically disclose having the video

information include video stills as in the claims. Maeno discloses a crime prevention monitoring

system (Amini: column 5, lines 10-45) which takes live video and generates still video images

of an intruder in the committing of a crime (Maeno: column 7, lines 35-67; column 8, lines 1-68;

column 9, lines 1-7: still image extraction as executed by the image collator of figure 2, element

206) in order to generate associated video indicia for monthly surveillance report generation

(Maeno: column 9, lines 13-47). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious

for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Maeno still image

extraction as implemented by the image collator into the Amini method in order to gain the

advantage of augmenting the event database with generated reports so that a more

comprehensive archiving of the Amini surveillance footage can be obtained. The Amini method,

now incorporating the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has all

of the features of claim 30.

Regarding claim 31, the Amini method, now incorporating the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has wherein the classification is accompanied by a predefined note (Maeno: column 9, lines 20-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 32, Amini method, now incorporating the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has further selecting a next guard tour from the list of available guard tours (Amini: column 13, lines 55-67), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 33-34, Amini method, now incorporating the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has generating a report, including information describing the at least one guard tour and the classification (Maeno: column 9, lines 20-47)); and transmitting the report to at least one designated recipient (Amini: column 10, lines 25-40), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 35, the Amini method, now incorporating the Maeno still image extraction as implemented by the image collator, has wherein the classification is selected form a group consisting of Pass or Fail (Maeno: column 10, lines 40-58), Not Audited (Amini: column 5, lines 30-35: "Live"), Don't know (Amini: column 17, lines 45-55), and No Video (Amini: column 18, lines 25-35), as in the claim.

Conclusion

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                                            Andy S. Rao
                                                            Primary Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 2621

asr
/Andy S. Rao/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621
October 13, 2009